

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

1999



2004

Session document

FINAL
A5-0457/2001

19 December 2001

REPORT

on the Commission communication to the Council and the European Parliament 'Elements of a Strategy for the Integration of Environmental Protection Requirements into the Common Fisheries Policy'
(COM(2001) 143 – C5-0343/2001 – 2001/2143(COS))
Committee on Fisheries

Rapporteur: Vincenzo Lavarra

CONTENTS

Page

PROCEDURAL PAGE4

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION.....5

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT9

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH AND
CONSUMER POLICY.....13

PROCEDURAL PAGE

By letter of 16 March 2001, the Commission forwarded to the Council and the European Parliament a communication 'Elements of a Strategy for the Integration of Environmental Protection Requirements into the Common Fisheries Policy' (COM(2001) 143 – 2001/2143(COS)).

At the sitting of 3 September 2001 the President of Parliament announced that she had referred the communication to the Committee on Fisheries as the committee responsible and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Policy for its opinion (C5-0343/2001).

The Committee on Fisheries had appointed Vincenzo Lavarra rapporteur at its meeting of 29 May 2001.

It considered the Commission communication and the draft report at its meetings of 10 July, 20 November and 18 December 2001.

At the last meeting it adopted the motion for a resolution by 10 votes to 1, with 0 abstentions.

The following were present for the vote: Daniel Varela Suanzes-Carpegna chairman; Rosa Miguélez Ramos, vice-chairman; Vincenzo Lavarra, rapporteur; Elspeth Attwooll, Arlindo Cunha, Carmen Fraga Estévez, Ian Stewart Hudghton, Salvador Jové Peres (for Mihail Papayannakis), Heinz Kindermann, Carlos Lage, Brigitte Langenhagen, Patricia McKenna, James Nicholson, Struan Stevenson (for Antonio Tajani) and Adriaan Vermeer.

The opinion of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Policy is attached.

The report was tabled on 19 December 2001.

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

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

European Parliament resolution on the Commission communication to the Council and the European Parliament 'Elements of a Strategy for the Integration of Environmental Protection Requirements into the Common Fisheries Policy' (COM(2001) 143 – C5-0343/2001 – 2001/2143(COS))

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the Commission communication (COM(2001) 143 – C5-0343/2001¹),
 - having regard to Rule 47(1) of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Fisheries and the opinion of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Policy (A5-0457/2001),
- A. whereas the definition of a strategy to improve the integration of environmental protection requirements into the common fisheries policy is a priority objective of Community policy, pursuant to Article 6 of the EC Treaty and to the commitments assumed by the European Council after the Cardiff summit in June 1998,
- B. whereas the Commission communication to the Council and the European Parliament is intended to provide the bases for designing a strategy to improve the integration of environmental protection requirements into the common fisheries policy,
- C. whereas the affirmation of the precautionary principle and the adoption of the FAO Code of Conduct lie at the foundations of the process of integrating environmental protection requirements into the common fisheries policy,
- D. whereas the fisheries sector is more often the victim than the author of environmental imbalances within the marine ecosystem, given that such imbalances arise from a development model which is external to the fisheries sector and is based on the uncontrolled exploitation of the environment and the coastal areas,
- E. whereas the integration of environmental protection requirements cannot be considered in the context of the Common Fisheries Policy alone, but rather the management of the marine environment as a whole,
- F. whereas the interaction between fisheries and the environment cannot be reduced to the supposed damaging effects of fisheries on the environment alone (overfishing of commercial stocks, risks to biodiversity and marine ecosystems, excess fishing capacity of the Community fleets, continuing risks of aquaculture); whereas, rather, reference needs also to be made to environmental measures which, if adopted, could directly improve matters for the fisheries sector (improvement of coastal areas, creation of restocking and nursery zones, protected marine areas, investment in research),
- G. whereas the Commission's alarm over the existing circumstances of overfishing and excessive fishing effort (arising from the excess capacity of the fleets) cannot be dispelled merely by reducing the numbers of vessels and the labour force,

¹ OJ not yet published

- H. whereas awareness of the economic and social consequences of integration is essential if full integration is to be phased in effectively, and measures must be preceded by detailed assessments of the socio-economic consequences involved,
1. Points out that the appropriate legal basis for environmental policy is Article 175 and that specific legislation on the protection of the marine environment stemming from the review of the common fisheries policy must take account of that fact;
 2. Considers that, if environmental-protection requirements are to be properly integrated into the CFP, the principles of that policy must include the Community environment policy principles set out in Article 174(2) of the Treaty;
 3. Welcomes the analysis and the guidelines contained in the Commission communication and instructs the Commission to put forward specific proposals for a sectoral integration strategy to be incorporated into the current review of the CFP;
 4. Reaffirms its determination to participate in the forthcoming review of the CFP with an approach based on the balance of the marine ecosystem, switching from a traditional resource management approach to an approach focusing on the ecosystem, including in relation to the adoption of TACs;
 5. Calls on the Commission to improve its definition of 'ecosystem and socio-economic benefits' in relation to the integration of environmental policies into the common fisheries policy, given that, while it is true that short-term losses may be offset by long-term benefits, it is also the case that short-term losses are frequently damaging for the producers and can provoke economic crises and drive operators out of the sector;
 6. Stresses that management measures must be properly evaluated in advance of their implementation, and risk analysis, such the consequences of displacing effort, must be properly balanced;
 7. While recognising the existence of the overfishing problem, calls on the Commission to put forward alternative or better-integrated proposals, in place of the simplistic solution of permanently decommissioning vessels and forcing fishermen out of the sector, a solution compounded by the absence of real or effective accompanying or supporting measures;
 8. Believes that current levels of industrial fisheries are highly detrimental both to the survival fish stocks for human consumption and the marine environment as a whole, and that the Commission must consider a real reduction in levels of industrial fisheries forthwith;
 9. Points out that the current shortage of resources makes it unjustifiable that one-third of Community fish catches should be destroyed as they are processed into fishmeal and fish oil and is concerned, from the point of view of food safety, at the high levels of pollution caused by dioxins in the areas where most of those fish are caught - fish which are mainly used as feed in aquaculture farms, which means that the dioxins enter the food chain;
 10. Calls on the Commission to carry out a thorough study on the environmental impact of aquaculture and industrial fishing and calls for these two sectors to be included in the review of the CFP - they are barely mentioned in the current Green Paper on the future of the CAP;
 11. Calls on the Commission to consider, among the possible alternatives to vessel decommissioning, the possible economic and environmental potential of creating biological rest areas, protected areas and nursery areas, with a view to favouring resource reproduction;
 12. Calls on the Commission to pay closer attention to restocking measures and responsible forms of aquaculture, since these are key means of integrating producers' resources and

reducing the fishing effort, and to introduce soft loan facilities for start-up activities by producer groups, given that such aid is necessary for the first three years until the facilities become fully productive;

13. Believes that in implementing the priority of environmental integration, the Commission must make provision for additional socio-economic measures to support the fisheries and aquaculture sectors in order to compensate those whose professional activity is significantly curtailed as a consequence, stressing that funding must be distributed in a fair and equitable manner, so as to ensure an effective means available to manage the socio-economic consequences of Community policies;
14. Calls on the Commission to consider introducing aid for the construction of new fishing vessels while decommissioning the higher-tonnage, more powerful types of vessel, since such a policy, backed up by modernisation, could help reduce the fishing effort and improve on-board working conditions and health and safety for fishermen, as well as saving energy and furthering the conservation of fisheries products;
15. Calls on the Commission to explain more precisely on what grounds it believes that environmental changes, whether arising from natural or human causes, in turn affect the biodiversity of habitats, marine life and the productivity of marine ecosystems, thus having adverse effects on fisheries and aquaculture;
16. Notes that an ecosystem-based approach means that measures to actively address external pollutants harmful to fisheries such as oil pollution and dioxins must be integral to the integration of environmental protection in fisheries and the marine environment as a whole;
17. Calls on the Commission to take into account the detrimental impact of biological developments on fish stocks and the ecosystem, such as the growth of algae resulting in fish diseases, and to facilitate research into the causes of such changes and, where appropriate, remedies;
18. Expresses deep concern at the development of genetically modified fish outside the European Union and that appropriate safeguards should be taken to ensure that such fish are not introduced with potentially devastating effects on the marine ecosystem(s) and that European consumers not be exposed to such foodstuffs;
19. Calls on the Commission to increase funding for the improvement of coordination and integration between research into fisheries and research into marine ecology, and to give particular support to research in regions characterised by diversification and multi-species fisheries;
20. Calls on the Commission to present key indicators which will make it possible to evaluate the impact on marine ecosystems of imbalances caused by fishing activity, either owing to preferential catches of certain species or to the various types of gear used;
21. Calls on the Commission to present the conclusions of studies into the harm caused by the various types of gear to fish, marine mammals and birds which become trapped in nets or caught on hooks and to propose appropriate measures;
22. Calls on the Commission to make stronger efforts to involve those directly interested, including the social partners, on a basis of decentralised management in the context of regional strategy, since such actions tend to reinforce the principles of responsibility;

23. Calls on the Commission to extend the 'polluter pays' principle to the fisheries sector, with a view to identifying responsibility and penalising the authors of polluting acts which undermine the markets and consumer confidence while putting fishermen's incomes at risk;
24. Calls on the Commission to pay greater attention to the specific character of regions such as the Mediterranean, whose fishery is inherently of a multi-species nature, and to take specific measures for the aspects related to structural, market and international policy, as well as carrying out monitoring and identifying performance indicators on the basis of cooperation with specific scientific and technical bodies within the sector;
25. Hopes that the multinational forums which are to be set up on an ad hoc basis will be conceived so as to take due account of geographically specific factors;
26. Calls on the Commission to pay greater attention to eco-labelling, since this practice tends to increase consumer confidence and willingness to buy, and can act as an indirect stimulus to production in the sector, since it brings increased added value in its wake;
27. Calls on the Commission not to transfer monitoring responsibilities to the producers themselves, since such responsibilities properly belong to the decision-making and administrative structures of the institutions, which should take steps to improve or adapt their own monitoring and surveillance systems;
28. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission and the Parliaments of the Member States.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The need to integrate environmental protection requirements into the common fisheries policy is a strategic priority, at least in terms of the importance of relaunching the European fisheries sector with a series of measures aimed at bolstering its sustainability and competitiveness in the age of globalisation.

The series of food scandals in other sectors, as well as the repeated dioxin alarms in the fisheries sector, should make it clear that swift and effective action is called for.

The Commission's initiative in opening the debate with this communication is to be welcomed; however, a large-scale consultation effort will be needed if there is to be agreement on the nature of this major process, whose positive effects should benefit all parties, and especially the sectors directly involved, with particular reference to the environment and the fisheries operators.

If the key concern is, then, to stress environmental protection as an absolute priority, the strategy for integration of the environment factor into the CFP cannot be confined to proposing penalisation and restrictions: rather, integration must be presented as a major additional resource and opportunity for the development of the sector.

The point of departure must therefore be that the fisheries sector is less author than victim of the ecological imbalances existing in the marine ecosystem. These imbalances arise from a development model which is external to the fisheries sector and is based on the uncontrolled exploitation of the environment and the coastal areas.

However, the Commission's communication tends, rather, to stress the need for the fisheries sector to adapt itself to environmental criteria. It does not pay sufficient attention to the need for environmental initiatives aimed at, for instance, facilitating a suitable programme for stock restoration which would at one and the same time benefit the ecosystem and raise income and employment levels in the sector.

In fact, the communication, where it speaks of the interaction between the fisheries sector and the environment, does little more than list the presumed harmful effects of fisheries on the environment (overfishing of commercial stocks, threats to biodiversity and marine ecosystems, overcapacity of the Community fleets, continued risks associated with aquaculture), and makes little reference to certain environmental measures which, if adopted, could directly benefit the fisheries sector (improvement of coastal areas, creation of restocking and nursery zones, protected marine areas, investment in research).

A further consequence of this approach is the Commission's continued stress on the present situation of overfishing and excessive fishing effort arising from fleet overcapacity. The Commission takes the view that the problems can be resolved almost exclusively by reducing the number of vessels and cutting back the workforce: it continues to promote this line without being aware of the deep-running contradiction between the conviction with which it makes such statements and its own, in-context admission of uncertainty in the face of the 'lack of scientific knowledge about the functioning of marine ecosystems and the side-effects of fishing'.

There is no doubt that the overfishing problem is real. Nonetheless, given the difficult circumstances of the sector, it appears necessary to draw up fresh proposals as an alternative to the simplistic solution of decommissioning vessels and forcing fishermen to abandon the sector - especially as accompanying or support measures are either non-existent or totally inadequate.

The Commission states that 'there is no doubt that integration will have economic and social consequences' (with the sector asked to pay a price in terms of resources and unemployment). However, there is still no cofinanced social intervention plan based on the principle of subsidiarity for actions at Member State level; nor is it recognised that serious obstacles exist to the wholesale retraining of fishermen, in the form of low educational levels and high average age.

In the absence of compensation mechanisms, there is a risk that in some geographical areas cuts on their own will have no benefits for the environment or the stocks. This has already happened in the case of the total ban on certain types of tackle (we refer to the driftnets case) in the Mediterranean, where driftnet use by the Community vessels has been outlawed (approximate numbers of this type of vessel in the Italian fleet have fallen from 650 to 100), while the number of third-country vessels employing driftnets in the same waters has risen to 500.

The Commission says that 'the Common Fisheries Policy has traditionally dealt with environmental matters in a reactive way, when they become a major problem', and promises the adoption of an environmental strategy for fisheries problems. This points up the faulty reasoning at the heart of the Community's approach.

It is crystal-clear to operators in the sector that if the binary relationship between fisheries and the environment is to be admitted, account must be taken in full of the damage caused to the sector by other human activities, and, notably, pollution.

The Commission appears to have a different notion of integrating environmental protection, amounting to a passive, second-level adaptation of the CFP to environmental objectives. Its view is that a reformed CFP must adapt to environmental policy, with no room left for the converse process.

This is all the more surprising given that, summing up this supposed need and in an attempt to justify application of the precautionary principle, the Commission argues that 'existing knowledge already permits steps in the right direction', even though in the first pages of the communication it admits that existing scientific knowledge of marine ecosystems is inadequate.

Reference to the precautionary principle in its scientific dimension should also take due account of other factors, such as non-discrimination, cost-benefit analysis, monitoring and the burden of proof (cf. the Commission communication of 2 February 2001).

The communication is more balanced where, in addition to setting out the problems related to the direct or indirect impact of fisheries activities on marine ecosystems, it raises the problem of environmental changes, whether arising from human or from natural causes, which have

repercussions on the productivity of ecosystems and, therefore, on fisheries. It is essential to recognise the existence of risk factors which are associated with fisheries but are caused by environmental deterioration. Once the 'polluter pays' principle is accepted, one has inevitably to ask who should pay if, for example, high concentrations of dioxin were to be found in fisheries products. It is difficult to imagine what kind of responsible attitude might be adopted by the operators that could actually avert such side-effects, since they themselves would be among those to bear the brunt. It appears that fisheries operators are being asked to assume a greater burden of responsibility than that applying in other productive sectors (e.g. maritime transport or coastal industries); if this is the case, it is essential to achieve higher levels of involvement in the definition and administration of policy.

Environmental research is another important aspect. There is a lack of scientific knowledge regarding the workings of marine ecosystems and the side-effects of fisheries, but this is not the only problem. Rather, in all probability fisheries research and marine ecology research have not been properly coordinated, and the result has been that impressive individual results have not been integrated into a global approach. More funds are needed for research, and the specialised bodies concerned must be integrated into the system of commissions and committees responsible for research in the sector.

On the subject of structural policy, the Commission stresses its intention in the short term to eliminate forms of aid considered to be 'risky', and to convert them into positive actions. In particular, the aim is to end aid for vessel construction while, at the same time, decommissioning the higher-tonnage, more powerful types of vessel. Such aid can, however, contribute alongside modernisation to reducing the fishing effort and improving on-board working conditions and health and safety for fishermen, as well as saving energy, furthering the conservation of fisheries products and creating incentives for fisheries-related tourism.

In the paragraph on adaptation of the fleet to the marine ecosystem, the Commission, when examining the option of a 'a limited number of fish species to be targeted', fails to take account of the particular character of the Mediterranean, where the fishery is multi-species by nature. The characteristics of the Mediterranean (which should not be considered as a mere appendage of the seas of northern Europe) necessitate suitable and close attention, in terms of structural policy and the national and international markets, and also in relation to monitoring actions and the definition of performance indicators. These latter should involve specialised scientific and technical bodies within the sector, linked not only to the regional organisations mentioned in the document but also to, for instance, the FAO's General Fisheries Council for the Mediterranean, which is now playing a key role in relation to the state of exploitation of commercial stocks. It is essential for the Mediterranean too to be properly covered by the work of advisory scientific bodies, so as to ensure that the region does not end up with borrowed policies which may be appropriate for other geographical areas but will not work in the specific regional context.

A further contradiction in the communication is that the FIG funding referred to does not concern restocking, even though it is stated earlier in the text that this policy should be encouraged. Restocking and responsible aquaculture are, in fact, key policies for the integration of operators' resources and the reduction of the fishing effort. If aquaculture is not to remain a privilege for already capitalised entities which can withstand the first three years, until the facilities become fully productive, soft loan facilities must be provided for start-up activities by producer groups.

The chapter on the market and commercial policy places considerable emphasis on the presumed potential of GMOs, which, it is claimed, can compensate for wasted resources and supply/demand imbalances. In reality, the jury is still out on their effects on resources.

The section on eco-labelling seems not to have been given sufficient attention, at a time when, in the wake of the BSE panic and the reports on dioxin in fisheries products, consumers are now certainly more inclined to opt for environment-friendly products, thus encouraging producers in this direction, given the higher value added now involved.

Also relevant here is the promotion and development of methods aimed at yielding products of certifiable quality and at ensuring the traceability of fisheries products, notably in the context of aquaculture.

Finally, as far as the international context is concerned the Community must play a leading part in the establishment of transnational arrangements for resource management, since this objective can no longer be postponed.

13 September 2001

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH AND CONSUMER POLICY

for the Committee on Fisheries

on the communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on elements of a strategy for the integration of environmental protection requirements into the common fisheries policy
(COM(2001) 143 – C5-0343/2001 – 2001/2143(COS))

Draftsman: Laura González Álvarez

PROCEDURE

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Policy appointed Laura González Álvarez draftsman at its meeting of 26 June 2001.

It considered the draft opinion at its meetings of 27 August and 12 September 2001.

At the last meeting it adopted the following conclusions unanimously.

The following were present for the vote: Guido Sacconi, acting chairman; Alexander de Roo, vice-chairman; Laura González Álvarez, draftsman; Per-Arne Arvidsson, Maria del Pilar Ayuso González, Jean-Louis Bernié, Hans Blokland, John Bowis, Hiltrud Breyer, Dorette Corbey, Anne Ferreira, Cristina García-Orcoyen Tormo, Robert Goodwill, Françoise Grossetête, Cristina Gutiérrez Cortines, Jutta Haug (for Bernd Lange), Anneli Hulthén, Marie Anne Isler Béguin, Hans Kronberger, Peter Liese, Torben Lund, Minerva Melpomeni Malliori, Patricia McKenna, Jorge Moreira da Silva, Rosemarie Müller, Riitta Myller, Karl Erik Olsson, Béatrice Patrie, Marit Paulsen, Frédérique Ries, Dagmar Roth-Behrendt, Giacomo Santini, Karin Scheele, Bart Staes (for Inger Schörling), Catherine Stihler, Antonios Trakatellis, Roseline Vachetta, Kathleen Van Brempt (for David Robert Bowe) and Phillip Whitehead.

SHORT JUSTIFICATION

This communication on the need to integrate environment policy has been published as part of the review of the common fisheries policy (CFP). Integration has been discussed at a whole series of Council meetings, in Cardiff (1998), in Cologne and Helsinki (1999) and in Feira (2000), and finally produced a result in Göteborg (Spring 2001) as part of an overall approach based on sustainable development in which synergy is to be sought between economic, social and environmental policies.

In its preparations for the Göteborg Council, Parliament had also expressed the view that the Cardiff process is a fundamental part of the strategy for sustainable development and that this strategy should become the motor for future actions aimed at integrating the environmental dimension.

Let us briefly recall some of the Göteborg Council conclusions on managing natural resources more responsibly:

- 'the review of the common fisheries policy in 2002 should, based on a broad political debate, address the overall fishing pressure by adapting the EU fishing effort to the level of available resources, taking into account the social impact and the need to avoid over-fishing';
- 'halting biodiversity decline with the aim to reach its objective by 2010 as set out in the 6th environmental action programme';
- 'examine, for the purposes of implementing the [sustainable development] strategy, the proposals in the Commission communication, in particular its proposals for headline objectives and measures, as well as the 6th Environmental Action Programme and the sector strategies for environmental integration'.

How can the balanced management of resources become the motor for the success of fishing activity? The management of resources is the first step in conserving species and preserving the balance of marine ecosystems. The excess capacity of the European fishing fleet, put at 40% and encouraged by the CFP, bears the main responsibility for the excessive fishing pressure on stocks and the poor economic efficiency of fishing activities. Employment declined by 19% in the actual fishing industry between 1990 and 1997, and by 10% in the processing industry. Fishing gear has also become more and more effective and is sometimes used too close to the coastline, as in the case of trawling, for example, becoming incompatible with the preservation of the marine environment.

Aquaculture is a sector which has undergone a somewhat uncontrolled expansion and which needs to integrate environmental requirements, particularly as regards controlling water pollution, whilst responding to consumers' concerns regarding checks on the nutritional and health-related quality of farmed fish.

The meal-producing fishing industry also contributes to pressure on stocks. Fishmeal is used in aquaculture but is also an ingredient in animal meal intended for other species. In the wake of the recent food crises in the EU, strict rules need to be established on the production of such meal and the sector needs to be included in the review of the CFP.

The management of marine resources is an international issue. The European Union must play an active part in the conservation of species during negotiations on fisheries agreements in the knowledge that promoting sustainable fishing will be the best way of protecting its fishermen. The EU stands accused of over-exploiting the resources of third countries. It needs to provide access for its fleet to the rich waters of certain countries whilst practising balanced fishing so as not to endanger individual species, respecting breeding seasons, using only the permitted gear and being scrupulous in the application of Community rules on preventing pollution.

Our committee is also conscious of the overall context of the problems relating to marine ecosystems, having recently discussed integrated coastal management in Europe and cooperation in the event of accidental or deliberate marine pollution. Even though its opinion focuses on issues linked to the CFP, there are several sources of pollution which endanger the balance of the aquatic environment apart from fishing. The search for a solution must involve all factors.

Indicators play a decisive role in future decision-making. Detailed knowledge must be available on the current state of stocks, biological diversity and levels of marine pollution. Many of the most profitable fish stocks found in Community waters are subject to over-fishing and have now fallen below the biological safety threshold. The result is an as yet little studied imbalance in the marine food chain.

CONCLUSIONS

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Policy calls on the Committee on the Fisheries, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following points in its motion for a resolution:

1. Points out that the appropriate legal basis for environmental policy is Article 175 and that specific legislation on the protection of the marine environment stemming from the review of the common fisheries policy must take account of that fact;
2. Welcomes the analysis and the guidelines contained in the Commission communication and instructs the Commission to put forward specific proposals for a sectoral integration strategy to be incorporated into the current review of the CFP;
3. Considers that, if environmental-protection requirements are to be properly integrated into the CFP, the principles of that policy must include the Community environment policy principles set out in Article 174(2) of the Treaty;
4. Reaffirms its determination to participate in the forthcoming review of the CFP with an approach based on the balance of the marine ecosystem, switching from a traditional resource management approach to an approach focusing on the ecosystem, including in relation to the adoption of TACs;
5. Calls on the Commission to carry out a thorough study on the environmental impact of aquaculture and industrial fishing and calls for these two sectors to be included in the review of the CFP - they are barely mentioned in the current Green Paper on the future

of the CAP;

6. Points out that the current shortage of resources makes it unjustifiable that one-third of Community fish catches should be destroyed as they are processed into fishmeal and fish oil and is concerned, from the point of view of food safety, at the high levels of pollution caused by dioxins in the areas where most of those fish are caught - fish which are mainly used as feed in aquaculture farms, which means that the dioxins enter the food chain;
7. Calls on the Commission to present key indicators which will make it possible to evaluate the impact on marine ecosystems of imbalances caused by fishing activity, either owing to preferential catches of certain species or to the various types of gear used;
8. Calls on the Commission to present the conclusions of studies into the harm caused by the various types of gear to fish, marine mammals and birds which become trapped in nets or caught on hooks and to propose appropriate measures.