

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

1999



2004

Session document

29 January 2004

FINAL
A5-0024/2004

REPORT

on the proposal for a Council regulation establishing measures for the recovery of the Northern hake stock
(COM(2003) 374 – C5-0314/2003 – 2003/0137(CNS))

Committee on Fisheries

Rapporteur: Dominique F.C. Souchet

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
DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION.....	5
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	17

PROCEDURAL PAGE

By letter of 9 July 2003 the Council consulted Parliament pursuant to Article 37 of the EC Treaty on the proposal for a Council regulation establishing measures for the recovery of the Northern hake stock (COM(2003) 374 – 2003/0137(CNS)).

At the sitting of 1 September 2003 the President of Parliament announced that he had referred the proposal to the Committee on Fisheries as the committee responsible (C5-0314/2003).

The Committee on Fisheries had appointed Dominique F.C. Souchet rapporteur at its meeting of 9 July 2003.

The committee considered the Commission proposal and the draft report at its meetings of 9 September, 2 October, 25 November and 4 December 2003 and 4 January 2004.

At the last meeting it adopted the draft legislative resolution by 13 votes to 3, with no abstentions.

The following were present for the vote: Struan Stevenson, chairman, Rosa Miguélez Ramos, vice-chairman, Dominique F.C. Souchet, rapporteur, Elspeth Attwooll, Niels Busk, Salvador Jové Peres, Heinz Kindermann, Carlos Lage, Giorgio Lisi, Ioannis Marinos, John Joseph McCartin (for Brigitte Langenhagen), Patricia McKenna, Manuel Pérez Álvarez, Joaquim Piscarreta, Catherine Stihler, Margie Sudre (for Hugues Martin) and Daniel Varela Suanzes-Carpegna.

The report was tabled on 29 January 2004.

DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

on the proposal for a Council regulation establishing measures for the recovery of the Northern hake stock
(COM(2003) 374 – C5-0314/2003 – 2003/0137(CNS))

(Consultation procedure)

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(2003) 374¹,
 - having regard to Article 37 of the EC Treaty, pursuant to which the Council consulted Parliament (C5-0314/2003),
 - having regard to Rule 67 of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Fisheries (A5-0024/2004),
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 if it intends to depart from the text approved by Parliament;
 4. Asks the Council to consult Parliament again if it intends to amend the Commission proposal substantially;
 5. Instructs its President to forward its position to the Council and Commission.

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendments by Parliament

Amendment 1 Title

COUNCIL REGULATION establishing
measures for the recovery of the Northern
hake stock

COUNCIL REGULATION establishing ***a
management plan for*** the Northern hake
stock

*(This amendment requires suitable
adjustments to be made to the recitals
relating to the stock situation; the
references to a recovery plan also need to
be changed throughout the proposal.)*

¹ OJ C ## , ##, p. ## / Not yet published in OJ.

Justification

The latest scientific data indicate that the Northern hake stock is not outside safe biological limits. Therefore, rather than adopting a recovery plan under the provisions of Article 5 of Regulation (EC) No 2371/2002, it would be more appropriate to adopt a management plan, pursuant to Article 6 thereof. This means it would be unnecessary to adopt fishing effort management measures for this species.

Amendment 2 Recital -1 (new)

(-1) The new common fisheries policy has the aim of permitting sustainable exploitation of living aquatic resources while taking account in a balanced manner of the environmental, social and economic implications.

Justification

Council Regulation (EC) No 2371/2002 of 20 December 2002 expressly refers to this requirement of compatibility and consistency between the two aspects - biological and environmental on the one hand and socioeconomic on the other - of the new Common Fisheries Policy. The proportionality rule should be applied to any new measure for the management of the resource, taking the maximum account of this requirement and avoiding any imbalance between the two aspects, the biological and the socioeconomic. Parliament has already called for 'the interdisciplinary nature of the sciences (including Economics and Social Sciences) [to be put] at the heart of the process of formulating scientific opinions' (cf. Paragraph 5 of the report on integrating environmental protection requirements into the Common Fisheries Policy adopted by the EP on 22 October 2002 - A5-0360/2002).

Amendment 3 Recital 1

(1) Recent scientific advice from the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) has indicated that the ***Northern*** hake stock ***in Community waters*** ***has suffered from levels of mortality by fishing which have eroded the quantities of mature fish in the sea to the point at which this stock may not be able to replenish itself by reproduction and that the stocks are therefore threatened with collapse.***

(1) Recent scientific advice from the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) has indicated that the hake stock ***would reach a totally secure level if the level of mortality by fishing were to be maintained over the next five to eight years; it is therefore unnecessary to introduce a recovery plan for this fishery, given that such measures would be disproportionate to the objectives pursued and would have a serious and unjustifiable socio-economic impact.***

Justification

The Commission proposal to introduce a recovery plan for the Northern hake stock seeks simply to transpose to this fishery the measures applied to cod, something for which there is no justification. The Commission fails to take account of the most recent advice from the ICES Advisory Committee for Fisheries Management (ACFM), which rejects the idea of taking drastic measures. The ACFM considers that the Northern hake stock would reach a totally secure level if the level of mortality by fishing recorded over recent years were to be maintained. It recommends the introduction of a TAC that is compatible with maintaining the biomass.

Amendment 4 Recital 3

(1) Measures need to be taken to establish a multi-annual plan for ***the recovery of*** this stock.

(1) Measures need to be taken to establish a multi-annual ***management*** plan for this stock.

Justification

A recovery plan for this stock would be excessive. A management plan will be quite enough.

Amendment 5 Recital 3^oa (new)

(3a) The Regional Advisory Councils provided for in Articles 31 and 32 of Council Regulation (EC) No 2371/2002 of 20 December 2002 on the conservation and sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources under the Common Fisheries Policy, which will be affected by this management plan, should be consulted as soon as they are established.

¹ OJ L 358, 31.12.2002, p. 59

Justification

With a view to improving governance of the common fisheries policy, Regulation (EC) No 2371/2002 provides for the establishment of Regional Advisory Councils. These councils should be closely involved in the drafting of recovery plans, with a view to fostering mutual trust between scientists and fishermen. It would be highly advisable for the Commission to involve the Regional Advisory Councils in the socio-economic study it is to draw up, given that they will be closely affected by the study.

Amendment 6

Recital 4

(4) It is expected that ***recovery of the stock*** under the conditions of this Regulation ***will take between five and ten years.***

(4) It is expected that under the conditions of this Regulation ***the stock will be maintained within biologically safe limits.***

Justification

Talk of 'recovery' of this stock is excessive. It is in a much better state than other stocks to which no restrictions of any kind apply.

Amendment 7

Recital 5

(5) ***The objective of the plan should be considered to be achieved for this stock when, for two consecutive years, the quantity of mature Northern hake has been greater than the level set by managers as being within safe biological limits.***

deleted

Justification

It would be excessive to introduce a recovery plan for the Northern hake stock. Implementation of a TAC management plan will be enough to ensure sustainable fishing of this species.

Amendment 8

Recital 7

(7) Such control of the fishing mortality rate can be achieved by establishing an appropriate method for the establishment of the level of Total Allowable Catches (TACs) of the stock ***concerned, and a system whereby fishing effort on this stock is restricted to levels at which the TACs are unlikely to be exceeded.***

(7) Such control of the fishing mortality rate can be achieved by establishing an appropriate method for the establishment of the level of Total Allowable Catches (TACs) of the stock.

Justification

There is no need for a recovery plan for this fishery; the social and economic impact of such a plan would be disproportionate to the objectives pursued.

Amendment 9

Recital 8

(8) The great majority of the Northern hake stock in question resides in a geographical area to the west and south of Ireland, in the western Channel and in the Bay of Biscay ***and it is in those areas that levels of fishing effort should be reduced.*** Furthermore, ***similar*** constraints adopted for the ***recovery*** of cod stocks will assist the ***recovery*** of that part of the Northern hake stock concerned which resides outside these areas.

(8) The great majority of the Northern hake stock in question resides in a geographical area to the west and south of Ireland, in the western Channel and in the Bay of Biscay. Furthermore, ***the*** constraints adopted for the ***management*** of cod stocks will assist the ***sustainable management*** of that part of the Northern hake stock concerned which resides outside these areas.

Justification

The Commission proposal to introduce a recovery plan for the Northern hake stock seeks simply to transpose to this fishery the measures applied to cod, something for which there is no justification. The Commission fails to take account of the most recent advice from the ICES Advisory Committee for Fisheries Management (ACFM), which rejects the idea of taking such drastic measures.

Amendment 10

Recital 9

(9) Once recovery has been achieved the Council should decide upon follow-up measures in accordance with Article 6 of Council Regulation 2371/2002 of 20 December 2002 on the conservation and sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources under the Common Fisheries Policy, ***deleted***

Justification

This recital will be redundant if a management plan is introduced.

Amendment 11

Recital 10

(10) To reduce the probability of overshooting of the TAC, it is necessary to restrict landings and transshipments of Northern hake and of species with which Northern hake are taken as by-catch to ***deleted***

***those vessels which fall within the system
adopted for the control of fishing effort,***

Justification

The state of the Northern hake stock does not warrant the introduction of a special control system.

Amendment 12

Recital 11

***(11) Control measures in addition to those deleted
laid down in Council Regulation (EEC)
No 2847/93 of 12 October 1993
establishing a control system applicable to
the common fisheries policy need to be
included in order to ensure compliance
with the measures laid down in this
Regulation,***

Justification

The state of the Northern hake stock does not warrant the introduction of special control measures.

Amendment 13

Article 1

This Regulation establishes a ***recovery programme*** for the Northern hake stock which inhabits the ICES Division IIIa, ICES Sub-area IV, ICES Divisions V(b) (Community waters), VIa (Community waters), ICES Sub-area VII and ICES Divisions VIIa,b,d,e (hereinafter referred to as “the Northern hake stock”).

This Regulation establishes a ***management plan*** for the Northern hake stock which inhabits the ICES Division IIIa, ICES Sub-area IV, ICES Divisions V(b) (Community waters), VIa (Community waters), ICES Sub-area VII and ICES Divisions VIIa,b,d,e (hereinafter referred to as “the Northern hake stock”).

Justification

The Commission proposal fails to take account of the most recent advice from the ICES Advisory Committee for Fisheries Management (ACFM), which rejects the idea of taking drastic measures in the Northern hake fishery. The ACFM considers that the stock of this species would reach a totally secure level if the level of mortality by fishing recorded over recent years were to be maintained. It recommends the introduction of a TAC that is compatible with maintaining the biomass.

Amendment 14
Article 2, heading

Purpose of the *recovery* plan

Purpose of the *management* plan

Amendment 15
Article 2

The *recovery* programme referred to in Article 1 shall aim to increase the quantities of mature fish of the Northern hake stock concerned to values equal to or greater than **143000** tonnes.

The *management* programme referred to in Article 1 shall aim to increase the quantities of mature fish of the Northern hake stock concerned to values equal to or greater than **140000** tonnes.

Justification

This figure has been changed in order to take account of the most recent ICES data on the state of the biomass.

Amendment 16
Article 2 a (new)

Article 2^oa

Improving the assessment system

In view of the major uncertainties still hanging over the actual state of the Northern hake stock, the system used to assess this resource shall be improved by stepping up scientific campaigns and ensuring that scientific calculations take due account of the practical observations made by fishermen.

As soon as they are established, the Regional Advisory Councils provided for in Articles 31 and 32 of Regulation (EC) No 2371/2002 shall forward their stock assessments, with a view to further enhancing the relevance of the scientific advice. In particular, the Regional Advisory Councils affected by the management plan shall forward their recommendations on the plan and shall be closely involved in the socio-economic impact study to be drawn up by the Commission.

Justification

There are major uncertainties hanging over the state of the Northern hake stock (stock of younger fish, growth rate, etc.). Research campaigns should therefore be stepped up and the additional appropriations earmarked should be allocated as a priority to this stock, given the very large number of ports and undertakings dependent on hake for their livelihoods. Parliament should reiterate the call it made in October 2002 for a detailed action plan aimed at further improving the stock assessment system by ensuring that it takes proper account of the practical, empirical knowledge of fishermen.

With a view to improving governance of the common fisheries policy, Regulation (EC) No 2371/2002 provides for the establishment of Regional Advisory Councils. These councils should be closely involved in the drafting of recovery plans, with a view to fostering mutual trust between scientists and fishermen.

Amendment 17 Article 3

Article 3

deleted

Reaching of target levels

Where the Commission finds, on the basis of advice from International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) and following agreement on that advice by the Scientific Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF), that for two consecutive years the target level for the Northern hake stock concerned has been reached, the Council shall decide by qualified majority on a proposal from the Commission to replace the recovery plan by a management plan for the stock in accordance with Article 6 of Regulation 2371/2002.

Justification

In line with the previous amendments by the same author.

Amendment 18 Article 4

A TAC shall be set in accordance with Article 5 where, for the Northern hake stock concerned the quantities of mature Northern hake have been estimated by the STECF, in the light of the most recent

A TAC shall be set in accordance with Article 5 where, for the Northern hake stock concerned the quantities of mature Northern hake have been estimated by the STECF, in the light of the most recent

report of ICES, to be equal to or above
103000 tonnes.

report of ICES, to be equal to or above
100000 tonnes.

Justification

To take account of the most recent ICES data.

Amendment 19
Article 5, paragraph 2

2. The TAC shall not exceed a level of catches which a scientific evaluation carried out by the STECF, in the light of the most recent report of ICES, has indicated will result in an increase of 10% in the quantity of mature fish in the sea at the end of the year of their application compared to the quantity estimated to have been in the sea at the start of that year. **deleted**

Amendment 20
Article 5, paragraph 3

3. The Council shall not adopt a TAC whose capture is predicted by the STECF, in the light of the most recent report of the ICES, to generate in its year of application a fishing mortality rate greater than **0.24**. 3. The Council shall not adopt a TAC whose capture is predicted by the STECF, in the light of the most recent report of the ICES, to generate in its year of application a fishing mortality rate greater than **0.25**.

Justification

The article should merely indicate that the management plan will be based on the setting of a TAC that will generate a fishing mortality rate no higher than 0.25 (rather than 0.24), with downward variations being no greater than 15%. This mechanism will ensure that the stock will reach 140 000 tonnes before the period specified in the recovery plan previously provided for (5 to 7 years); that plan is therefore unnecessary.

Amendment 21
Article 5, paragraph 4

4. Where it is expected that the setting of the TAC for a given year in accordance with paragraph 2 will result in a quantity of mature fish at the end of that year in excess of the target level indicated in Article 2, the TAC shall not be set in accordance with paragraph 2, but at a **deleted**

level of catches, which following a scientific evaluation carried out by STECF in the light of the most recent report of ICES, will result in an expected quantity of mature fish at the end of that year being equal to the target level indicated in Article 2.

Amendment 22
Article 5, paragraph 5, point (a)

<i>(a) in the event that the rules provided for in paragraphs 2 or 4 would lead to a TAC for a given year which exceeds the TAC of the preceding year by more than 15%, the Council shall adopt a TAC which shall not be more than 15% greater than the TAC of that year or;</i>	<i>deleted</i>
--	----------------

Amendment 23
Article 5, paragraph 5, point (b)

<i>(b) in the event that the rule provided for in paragraphs 2 or 4 would lead to a TAC for a given year which is more than 15% less than the TAC of the preceding year, the Council shall adopt a TAC which is not more than 15% less than the TAC of that year.</i>	<i>(b) in the event that the rule provided for in paragraph 3 would lead to a TAC for a given year which is more than 15% less than the TAC of the preceding year, the Council shall adopt a TAC which is not more than 15% less than the TAC of that year.</i>
--	--

Amendment 24
Article 5, paragraph 6

<i>6. Paragraphs 4 or 5 shall not apply when their application would imply that the value laid down in paragraph 3 will be exceeded.</i>	<i>deleted</i>
--	----------------

Amendment 25
Article 6

<i>Where the quantities of mature fish of the Northern hake stock concerned have been estimated by the STECF, in the light of the most recent report of the ICES, to be</i>	<i>deleted</i>
---	----------------

less than 103000 tonnes, the following rules shall apply:

(a) Article 5 shall apply where its application is expected to result in an increase in the quantities of mature fish, at the end of the year of application of the TAC to a quantity equal to or greater than 103000 tonnes;

(b) where the application of Article 5 is not expected to result in an increase in the quantities of mature fish, at the end of the year of application of the TAC, to a quantity equal to or greater than 103000 tonnes, the decision by the Council under Art. 5(1) shall ensure that the quantity of mature fish at the end of the year of application of the TAC is expected to be equal to or greater than 103000 tonnes.

Justification

The suddenness of the measures adopted under an exceptional arrangement would be such as to completely destroy the balance of the industries concerned and would constitute an abandonment of the gradual multiannual approach which should characterise the recovery plans. The concept of 'exceptional circumstances' introduces a factor of uncertainty in so far as it is based on a threshold of collapse calculated in the light of a target level using an esoteric mathematical formula.

The establishment of an exceptional arrangement would seriously disturb business, as any market which is insufficiently supplied tends to fade away. By the time that stocks were being managed again, the market would have been thoroughly restructured to the advantage of other species to which exceptional arrangements did not apply and to the advantage of imports.

Amendment 26 **Chapter IV**

Chapter IV

deleted

(entire chapter)

Justification

The Commission proposal to introduce a recovery plan for the Northern hake stock fails to take account of the most recent advice from the ICES Advisory Committee for Fisheries Management (ACFM), which rejects the idea of taking drastic measures. The ACFM considers that the Northern hake stock would reach a totally secure level if the mortality rate were to be maintained over the coming years.

Amendment 27
Chapter V

Chapter V *deleted*
(entire chapter)

Justification

The state of the hake stock does not warrant the introduction of special control measures.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

BACKGROUND

On 27 June 2003, the Commission published a new proposal on the Northern hake stock. This followed the proposals already submitted in December 2001 relating to cod and Northern hake (COM(2001) 724) and resubmitted in amended form in 2002 (COM(2002) 773).

The proposal now under consideration is one of those concerning plans for the recovery of stocks deemed to be under threat as provided for by Council Regulation (EC) No 2371/2002 of 20 December 2002 on the conservation and sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources under the Common Fisheries Policy.

It is the second plan of this type submitted by the Commission, and will be followed by plans for Southern hake, sole and Norway lobster.

A specific proposal for the recovery of cod stocks has been drafted.

The Commission has thus finally decided to deal with cod and hake separately. This option ought in principle to make it possible to assess the situations of each of these two resources better, the trend in hake stocks in the past two years having been that the level of the stock is improving thanks to the management measures already taken.

The aim of the proposal is to bring about a lasting recovery of the Northern hake stock by restoring it to the level which the Commission regards as constituting 'reasonable biological limits'.

The measures which the Commission proposes are to be implemented over a long period (5 to 10 years).

The Commission bases its proposal on scientific opinions the substance of which it does not divulge and on which it has not enlarged when meeting the Committee on Fisheries, despite the latter's request.

SUBSTANCE OF THE COMMISSION PROPOSAL

The draft recovery plan comprises three main elements:

rules for setting TACs

These rules are intended to ensure the gradual restoration of the biomass at a rate of 10% per annum. They entail a severe reduction in catches and fishing effort.

Under these rules, two systems are proposed:

a normal system which applies when biomass is estimated to lie between B_{pa} (biomass which can be exploited sustainably) and B_{lim} (biomass limit),

an exceptional system applicable when the stock is below the threshold for collapse (B_{lim}), intended to restore the biomass to a level above this threshold within a year.

In addition, it is intended that the level of variation of TAC levels should not exceed a maximum of 15% between two consecutive years, **but this rule does not apply to the first year of implementation.**

rules on the management of fishing effort

The Commission proposes that limits on fishing effort (kilowatt-days) should be distributed among the Member States on the basis of the recent activities of vessels which have fished for hake (reference period: 2000-2002).

When a reduction in TAC is applied, **a corresponding reduction in fishing effort** is imposed on each country in proportion to the quantity of hake landed during the reference period.

Each Member State must then set an individual limit on fishing effort per vessel and translate it into a number of days of absence from port.

The list of vessels authorised to fish in the area covered by the plan is forwarded to the Commission: it is then forbidden for any vessel which does not appear on this list to land hake or so-called associated species, i.e. megrim, anglerfish or Norway lobster.

specific monitoring measures

The provisions concerning monitoring refer to fishing effort messages, limits on authorised landing ports, prior notification of landings of more than one tonne and stowage and transport of hake.

REMARKS

1. The basis for the proposal

It is regrettable that the Commission's proposal concerning Northern hake has been drafted without seriously involving representatives of the industry in the assessment of stocks, contrary to what Parliament has called for, particularly in its opinion on integrating environmental protection requirements into the Common Fisheries Policy¹.

The Commission proposal establishing a plan for the recovery of the Northern hake stock does not appear to be a measure proportionate to the state of the stock concerned as revealed by recent scientific reports and the observations of fishermen. As the Northern hake stock is not outside safe biological limits, it is not appropriate to apply to it a recovery plan pursuant to Article 5 of Regulation (EC) No 2371/2002. It is therefore not desirable to superimpose on the system of management by TACs another management system via fishing effort. This system of kilowatt-days in any case seems extremely complex and there are serious doubts as to its practicability.

The Northern hake stock should be covered by a multiannual management plan pursuant to Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 2371/2002, which will give people in the industry the profile and the security they need.

¹ Souchet report on integrating environmental protection requirements into the Common Fisheries Policy adopted by the EP on 22 October 2002 (A5-0360/2002).

2. Rule on setting of TACs and quotas

The approach adopted by the Commission is based purely on considerations of a biological nature and does not take account of the socioeconomic dimension. Thus it advocates restoring stocks to above the biological reference limit as quickly as possible, i.e. within one year. This approach is reflected in a proposal for a drastic reduction in TACs at the beginning of the plan which is manifestly incompatible with the survival of undertakings connected with fishing.

The graduated approach of a management plan with multiannual TACs is the one which should be adopted in order to achieve the aim of stabilising and improving this stock.

3. Rule for the reduction of fishing effort

- industry representatives are very doubtful about the effectiveness and practicability of this extremely complex system, as they made clear to us at the hearing held by the Committee on Fisheries on 25 November 2003.

The application of this rule is strongly contested by those within the industry, as they fear that **superimposing** a new fisheries management instrument on the system of TACs and quotas and on the specific management measures already adopted might jeopardise the principle of relative stability and contribute to an increase in discards. Many of them also doubt that a system for reducing fishing effort can effectively achieve the desired result in terms of improving stocks.

We do not have any scientific evaluation by ICES on this subject such as to guarantee that a reduction in effort really would reduce catches. Nor do we have an evaluation of the transitional measures taken to restore stocks under Annex XVII to the Regulation setting TACs and quotas for 2003.

- the effort reduction formula entails serious problems of equity and predictability.

Depending on the weight assigned to each reference datum (quantity of landings, level of fishing effort), it is liable to disadvantage one Member State in relation to another.

It institutes a uniform and rigid system which does not take any account of the specific characters of the various fleets, particularly their versatility.

It prevents any Member State from making forecasts from one year to the next, as it involves the data of all Member States.

In proposing substituting a multiannual management plan for the recovery plan advocated by the Commission, we are completely in line with the approach adopted by the European Parliament in October 2002¹, when it recommended that fragile stocks should be managed by adopting simple and flexible rules, such as multiannual TACs, rather than complex systems with uncertain effects, like the arrangements for management via fishing effort proposed by the Commission.

¹ Souchet report on integrating environmental protection requirements into the Common Fisheries Policy adopted by the EP on 22 October 2002 (A5-0360/2002).