

# EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

---

*Session document*

FINAL  
**A6-0163/2006**

4.5.2006

**\***

## **REPORT**

on the proposal for a Council regulation on the conclusion of the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Community and the Kingdom of Morocco  
(COM(2005)0692 – C6-0040/2006 – 2005/0280(CNS))

Committee on Fisheries

Rapporteur: Daniel Varela Suanzes-Carpegna

### ***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

|  | <b>Page</b> |
|--|-------------|
| DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION ..... | 5           |
| EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....                            | 11          |
| OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON DEVELOPMENT .....          | 18          |
| PROCEDURE.....   | 22          |



## DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

on the proposal for a Council regulation on the conclusion of the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Community and the Kingdom of Morocco (COM(2005)0692 – C6-0040/2006 – 2005/0280(CNS))

### (Consultation procedure)

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to the Commission proposal for a Council regulation (COM(2005)0692)<sup>1</sup>,
  - having regard to Articles 37 and 300(2) of the EC Treaty,
  - having regard to Article 300(3), first subparagraph, of the EC Treaty, pursuant to which the Council consulted Parliament (C6-0040/2006),
  - having regard to Rules 51 and 83(7) of its Rules of Procedure,
  - having regard to the opinion issued by Parliament's Legal Service (SJ-0085-06),
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on Fisheries and the opinions of the Committee on Budgets and the Committee on Development (A6-0163/2006),
1. Approves the proposal for a Council regulation as amended and approves conclusion of the agreement;
  2. Instructs its President to forward its position to the Council and Commission, and the governments and parliaments of the Member States and the Kingdom of Morocco.

Text proposed by the Commission

---

Amendments by Parliament

---

Amendment 1  
Recital 2 a (new)

***(2a) The Community financial contribution should also be used for the development of coastal populations living on fisheries in Morocco and Western Sahara and the creation of small and medium-sized local firms in the fisheries sector.***

---

<sup>1</sup> Not yet published in OJ.

Amendment 2  
Recital 3 a (new)

***(3a) The quality of the information made available to the European Parliament must be improved - hence the Commission must draw up an annual report on the implementation of the Agreement which covers each and every one of the fishing methods to which the Agreement applies and which includes the favourable opinions issued by the Commission pursuant to Article 6(2) of the Agreement.***

*Justification*

*The purpose of this amendment is to emphasise the fact that Parliament must be provided with suitable information which will enable it to assess the Agreement and to check that the new partnership agreements are working. This will enhance the role played by Parliament in monitoring the implementation of the Agreement.*

Amendment 3  
Article 1, paragraph 1

The Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Community and the Kingdom of Morocco is hereby approved on behalf of the Community.

The Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Community and the Kingdom of Morocco is hereby approved on behalf of the Community, ***subject to its implementation in accordance with international law.***

*Justification*

*The right to self-determination, including the right of permanent sovereignty over natural wealth and resources, is a norm of international law from which no derogation is permitted. Neither the Regulation nor the Agreement as they stand provide any safeguards for the Community (or the Member States) in the event of contraventions.*

Amendment 4  
Article 2, introductory sentence

The fishing opportunities set out in the Protocol to the Agreement shall be allocated among the Member States as follows:

The fishing opportunities set out in the Protocol to the Agreement ***and determined in accordance with the principles which enable relative stability to be maintained***

shall be allocated among the Member States as follows:

*Justification*

*Since fishing opportunities have been significantly reduced, several Member States are lobbying for an increase in the number of licences granted to their fleets. Irrespective of possible subsequent bilateral arrangements, the rights guaranteed under the principle of relative stability must be reflected in the text of the Regulation, as is the case with the Regulation governing TACs and quotas.*

Amendment 5

Article 3, paragraph 1 a (new)

***On the basis of those notifications and of information supplied by the Joint Committee established under Article 10 of the Agreement, the Commission shall report annually to the European Parliament and to the Council on its implementation.***

Amendment 6

Article 3, paragraph 1 b (new)

***In the event of evidence that the use to which the Agreement is being put is in contravention of international obligations, the Commission shall take immediate steps to suspend the Agreement as provided for in Article 15 of the Agreement.***

*Justification*

*It is the duty of the Commission as guardian of the Treaties to ensure compliance with international law.*

Amendment 7

Article 3 a (new)

***Article 3a***

***In its annual report to the European Parliament the Commission shall also include information relating to any changes in the state of the fish resources,***

***to measures designed to manage and conserve those resources and to the outcome of exploratory campaigns conducted in respect of new species pursuant to Article 5 of the Protocol.***

*Justification*

*Resource management and resource conservation are the key to enabling sustainable fishing to continue in the area. The Commission must give them impetus, analyse the way in which they evolve, propose a revision of fishing opportunities on the basis of such analysis and of exploratory campaigns (as referred to in Article 5 of the Protocol) and report on such matters to the European Parliament.*

Amendment 8  
Article 3 b (new)

***Article 3b***

***Pursuant to Article 4 of the Protocol the Commission shall - in the event of an improvement in the biological situation of cephalopod and crustacean stocks as confirmed by favourable scientific reports - endeavour to incorporate possible new fishing opportunities for those two categories into the Agreement.***

*Justification*

*Article 4 of the Protocol sets out the requirements for any review of the fishing opportunities, provided that this is compatible with the sustainable management of resources and is in accordance with favourable scientific opinion.*

Amendment 9  
Article 3 c (new)

***Article 3c***

***The technical and fisheries-management measures adopted by the Moroccan authorities for the benefit of local fleets shall also apply to the Community fleet operating under the terms of this Agreement.***



*Justification*

*The purpose of this agreement is to extend technical and fisheries-management measures to the Community fleet in order to prevent any occurrence of discrimination between fleets on account of the application of different technical and management measures.*

Amendment 10  
Article 3 d (new)

***Article 3d***

***In the course of the final year of the Protocol's validity and before any agreement to renew the Protocol is concluded, the Commission shall submit to the Council and the European Parliament a report on the implementation of the Agreement.***

*Justification*

*Before concluding any new agreement the Commission ought to ask the authorities of the State with which it is negotiating to provide it with information. The Commission will submit a general assessment report to Parliament and the Council on the basis of that information.*

Amendment 11  
Article 3 e (new)

***Article 3e***

***On the basis of the report referred to in Article 3d and after consulting the European Parliament, the Council shall if appropriate confer upon the Commission a negotiating mandate with a view to the adoption of a new Protocol.***

*Justification*

*Parliament and the Council will be able to meet their respective obligations only in the light of an assessment report on the implementation of the fisheries agreement.*

Amendment 12  
Article 3 f (new)

**Article 3f**

***The meetings and proceedings of the Joint Committee provided for in Article 10 of the Agreement may be attended by a Member of the European Parliament in an observer capacity, and also by representatives of the fisheries sector operating under the Agreement.***

*Justification*

*This is an Agreement of major political and financial significance to the EU's external relations in the fisheries sector, for which reason it must be made transparent and guarantees must be provided in respect of any proposed amendment.*

Amendment 13  
Article 3 g (new)

**Article 3g**

***The Commission shall inform the European Parliament of any initiative to amend the substance of the Agreement, including the Protocol, the datasheets and the appendices.***

*Justification*

*This is an Agreement of major political and financial significance to the EU's external relations in the fisheries sector, for which reason it must be made transparent and guarantees must be provided in respect of any proposed amendment.*

## EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

### I. INTRODUCTION

The Community and the Kingdom of Morocco have negotiated a Fisheries Partnership Agreement (initialled on 28 July 2005) under which Community fishermen are granted fishing opportunities, and also a Protocol and an Annex thereto in which are laid down the technical and financial terms and conditions governing EC vessels' fishing activities for a four-year period following the Agreement's entry into force. The Protocol and the Annex (with its appendices) form a whole with the Agreement and are regarded as an integral part thereof, as is stated in Article 16 of the Agreement on which Parliament is being asked for its opinion.

The Fisheries Agreement with Morocco has traditionally been the most important one concluded by the Community. As we shall see, this is no longer the case with this latest Agreement, since significant changes have been made to the provisions it contains by comparison with earlier agreements - to the extent that we can say that we are dealing with a new kind of fisheries agreement with Morocco.

The previous Agreement with Morocco covered the 1995-1999 period and it was highly ambitious both in terms of financial contribution and - in exchange - on account of the abundant fishing opportunities which it offered the Community as regards highly commercial species such as shellfish and cephalopods, which Morocco has excluded from the new Agreement. The previous Agreement was the only one not to include a renewal clause - a signal from Morocco to the effect that it was the last Agreement of its kind that it would conclude with the Community.

At the end of lengthy, difficult negotiations the Community was still unable to persuade Morocco to sign an Agreement similar to previous ones, since Morocco was adamant that commercial species of major interest to the Community would be excluded and that the remaining fishing opportunities would be subject to technical terms and conditions which the Community fisheries sector deemed unfair and unacceptable and under which fishing would cease to be economically viable. Hence official fisheries relations were broken off and the Community fisheries sector operating in the area underwent a major restructuring process, taking advantage - inter alia - of the funding earmarked for the Agreement. A special restructuring plan was approved for the affected fleet which in Spain alone covered approximately 244 of the 397 vessels which had been operating in Moroccan waters and which directly employed almost 4000 crew members.

The new Agreement which is now being submitted to Parliament differs greatly from its predecessor, since it is much more modest in terms of scope and objectives, number of vessels authorised and fishing opportunities granted. As a consequence the financial contribution is also reduced - down to EUR 36.1 million per year from the over EUR 100 million per year under the previous Agreement. The size of this latter figure was such that Parliament was legally obliged to approve that Agreement by means of the assent procedure. This is no longer the case with the new Agreement. Of the new amount, EUR 13.5 million per year is to be

allocated to developing the local fisheries sector, whilst shipowners are to pay EUR 3.4 million per year in licence fees.

Whereas the previous Agreement covered 629 vessels for the first year (with progressively smaller numbers in later years), the current Agreement provides initially for 119 vessels (mostly ones used in small-scale fishing) and for an annual quota of 60 000 TN for industrial pelagic fishing, mainly for the benefit of northern European countries which will be authorised to use large trawlers, including ones exceeding 3000 GT.

The current 'partnership' agreements are established on the basis of the acquisition of fishing opportunities for the Community fleet in exchange for a financial contribution and assistance in the development of the partner country's local fisheries sector, taking into account scientific assessments of the state of the resources in that country's waters and subject to monitoring and surveillance systems designed to prevent the overexploitation of stocks.

In general terms the new Agreement covers six types of fishing activity. Different rules have been laid down governing conditions, equipment and areas and these are summarised in the attached tables. The following aspects may be highlighted: no fishing is allowed in Morocco's Mediterranean waters and neither cephalopods (octopus and squid) nor crustaceans (prawns, langoustines and lobsters) may be caught. Such species were very important under earlier agreements on account of their high economic value. The Agreement focuses on small-scale fishing and for the first time it includes industrial pelagic fishing, mainly for human consumption.

## II. FISHING IN THE COASTAL WATERS OF WESTERN SAHARA

One of the concerns which has always arisen in the course of the negotiations on the fisheries agreements and protocols which the EU has concluded with the Kingdom of Morocco is that the Community fleet should operate in compliance with international law. This has been the case under all fisheries agreements.

In geographical terms the territory of Western Sahara is located on North Africa's Atlantic coast. It borders Morocco to the north and Mauritania to the south, and it became a Spanish province in 1884.

In 1976, Spain withdrew from the territory. Western Sahara was immediately occupied by troops from neighbouring countries (Morocco and Mauritania), who encountered opposition from broad swathes of the local population, mainly rallied around the Polisario Front.

Armed opposition prompted Mauritania to renounce its claims to the territory in 1979, which left Morocco as the *de facto* owner of the territory which had once been a Spanish province. This state of affairs has led to an armed conflict and to an international dispute which the UN seems unlikely to resolve in the near future.

The armed conflict between the Polisario Front and Morocco came to an end in 1991, when the UN initiated an attempt to settle the dispute between the Kingdom of Morocco and the Government of the Saharawi Arab Republic by means of an agreement providing for a referendum to be held under UN auspices (MINURSO) in order to enable the local people to

express their right to self-determination - meaning the formation of their own State or incorporation into Morocco. Since the two parties have been unable to reach an agreement on which people are entitled to vote, the conflict is at a standstill.

Under international law, Western Sahara currently has the status of a Non-Self-Governing Territory within the meaning of Article 73 of the UN Charter. Spain does not play its *de jure* administrative role and the territory is administered *de facto* by Morocco.

In the fisheries agreement under consideration here - as in all previous such agreements concluded by the Community - the international legal status quo is accepted and an effort is made not to intervene in the dispute and to uphold international law. This has been emphasised in all the legal opinions issued by the various EU institutions, including the EP Legal Service's own opinion which was drawn up at the Development Committee's request. It is for the power which actually administers the territory (i.e. the Kingdom of Morocco) to ensure - pursuant to UN rules - that if licences are issued for fishing operations in the waters along the coast of Western Sahara, the benefits accruing from economic activity contribute to the welfare of local people living in the territory.

The European Union and its institutions are obliged to ensure that international law is upheld, to which effect the Commission is responsible (via the Joint Committee provided for in Article 10 of the Agreement) for analysing whether Morocco is indeed performing its task of passing the benefits derived on to the local population and developing their fisheries sector.

### III. RAPPORTEUR'S COMMENTS

The rapporteur wishes to draw attention to the huge differences which exist between this Agreement and the previous one concluded between Morocco and the Community.

However, he would also like to point out that in this Agreement too the EU adopts the same political stance vis-à-vis Western Sahara as in all previous fisheries agreements with Morocco. He urges that this stance should remain unchanged, so as not to alter the international status quo prevailing in respect of the dispute, undermine the UN's principles or infringe international law. For this reason he incorporates into his report a citation referring to the EP Legal Service's opinion setting out the relevant principles of international law.

Furthermore, bearing in mind the length of the negotiations on the Agreement and the related implementing documents (negotiations which - even though the Agreement has now been signed and is now at the parliamentary stage - are still going on for the purpose of clarifying what has been agreed or - as the Commission itself acknowledged to the Committee on Fisheries - of 'fine-tuning' the content and introducing 'clarifications in respect of new interpretations'), the rapporteur has thought it necessary - by means of his amendments - to strengthen the monitoring mechanisms available to Parliament for the purpose of approving the Agreement and enabling it to come into effect. He has called upon the Commission to provide a comprehensive annual report on the implementation of the Agreement - together with the Protocol and the Annexes, which form an integral part thereof - in order to enable Parliament to assess more effectively and with greater transparency whether or not the various objectives stated in the Agreement have been achieved, whether or not the Agreement is fully operational, whether or not it acts in the interests of the parties involved and whether or not it

is cost-effective for the Community and its fisheries sector. This will afford the sector greater legal security, including monitoring of the application of the exclusivity clause laid down in the Agreement (Article 6) in order to ensure that other parties are not offered (by means of private agreements) opportunities to fish for high-commercial-value species which are withheld from the Community under the public Agreement on the pretext that resources have to be conserved.

For this same reason an amendment has also been tabled for the purpose of ensuring that Parliament is duly informed of changes in the state of fish resources in the area, of any resource-conservation and resource-management measures adopted, of scientific reports drawn up and of exploratory campaigns conducted for the purpose of stock evaluation with a view to establishing the state of and trends in resources. Such information will enable fishing opportunities to be revised through the inclusion - subject to favourable scientific reports and in accordance with the procedures laid down in Article 4 of the Agreement and Articles 3, 4 and 5 of the Protocol - of species which are currently excluded.

Lastly, on account of the major 'technical problems' which emerged following the signing into force of the Agreement, which the Commission has acknowledged and which affect fishing techniques such as seine fishing (fishing with lamps) and longline fishing (length, hooks), the distribution of pelagic fishing and landing in local ports, the Commission must be asked to keep Parliament informed regarding any changes it makes and to ensure that measures applied to local fleets are not discriminatory by comparison with those applied to the Community fleet.

| <b>PARAMETERS</b>   | <b>SMALL-SCALE FISHING/NORTH: PELAGIC SPECIES</b>                 | <b>SMALL-SCALE FISHING/NORTH: BOTTOM LONGLINE</b>        | <b>SMALL-SCALE FISHING/SOUTH</b>              |
|---------------------|---|--|---|
| Vessels authorised  | 20  | 30   | 20  |
| Type of vessel      | < 100 GT  | < 40 GT, 27 licences<br>> 40 GT and < 150 GT, 3 licences | < 80 GT                                       |
| Fees                | EUR 67 per GT per quarter   | EUR 60 per GT per quarter                                | EUR 60 GT per quarter                         |
| Geographical limit  | North of 38° 18'.<br>Beyond 2 nautical miles.                     | North of 34° 18'.<br>Beyond 6 nautical miles.            | South of 30° 40'.<br>Beyond 3 nautical miles. |
| Target species      | Anchovy, sardine and other pelagic species                        | Scabbardfish, sparidae and demersal species              | Croaker and sparidae                          |
| Landing requirement | First year 25%, second year 30%, third year 40%, fourth year 50%. | Voluntary landing  | Voluntary landing                             |
| Biological recovery | Two months: February and March.                                   | From 15 March to 15 May                                  | None  |

| <b>PARAMETERS</b>           | <b>DEMERSAL FISHING</b>  | <b>TUNA FISHING</b>   | <b>INDUSTRIAL PELAGIC FISHING</b>  |
|-----------------------------|--|---|--|
| Vessels authorised          | 22 vessels with a maximum of 11 trawlers per year.   | 27  | Maximum of 5-6 vessels over 3000 GT/vessel; 2-3 vessels between 150-3000 GT/vessel; 10 vessels under 150 GT/vessel   |
| Type of vessel              |  |   | Industrial pelagic trawler   |
| Types of fishing authorised | For longliners, bottom longline and deep-water multifilament fixed gillnet; for trawlers, bottom trawl | Pole-and-line Seine nets for fishing with live bait   | Pelagic or semipelagic   |
| Quota allocated             |  |   | 60 000 tonnes per year, maximum 10 000 tonnes per month  |
| Fees                        | EUR 53 per GT per quarter  | EUR 25 per tonne fished   | Maximum number of vessels authorised to fish at the same time: 18. Shipowner's fees per tonne of allowable catch: EUR 20 per tonne. Shipowner's fees per tonne in excess of allowable catch: EUR 50 per tonne. |
| Geographical limit          | South of 29°N. Beyond the 200 m isobath for trawlers (and 12 nautical miles for longliners).           | Beyond 3 miles. Capture of bait beyond 2 miles. All of Morocco's Atlantic zone, apart from a protected area east of a line from 33°30'N/7°35'W to 35°48'N/ 6°20'W | South of 29°N, beyond 15 nautical miles from the coasts calculated from the low-water line   |
| Target species              | Black hake, scabbardfish, leerfish/bonito  | Tunas   | Sardine, sardinella, mackerel, horse mackerel and  |



|                       |  |  |   |
|-----------------------|--|--|---|
|                       |  |  | anchovy   |
| Landing requirement   | 50% of catches made in Morocco   | A proportion to be landed in Morocco at international market prices. | Each vessel must land 25% of its catches in Morocco   |
| Biological recovery   | Only applicable to trawlers. The biological recovery period is that fixed for cephalopods. | None   | Authorised fishing vessels must observe all biological recovery periods laid down by the Ministry in the authorised fishing zone and stop any fishing activity there. |
| Industrial processing |  |  | Industrial processing of catches into fishmeal and/or fish oil is strictly prohibited.  |

23.2.2006

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

for the Committee on Fisheries

on the proposal for a Council regulation on the conclusion of the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Community and the Kingdom of Morocco (COM(2005)0692 – C6-0040/2006 – 2005/0280(CNS))

Draftsman: Thierry Cornillet

### **SHORT JUSTIFICATION**

The cooperation agreement with Morocco is the most important such agreement signed between the Community and a third country.

Following the negotiations concluded on 28 July 2005, Parliament is being asked to deliver its opinion on the document. Once adopted by the Council it will cover a period of four years and is renewable.

Even though the question immediately arises as to why a period of six months has elapsed between the Commission's initialling of the agreement and consultation of Parliament, the agreement's importance means that particular attention should be paid to its substance.

The EU has committed itself to ensuring the sustainable character of fisheries worldwide, as defined at the Johannesburg summit, by maintaining or restoring stock levels with a view to the most sustainable exploitation possible.

The EU has signed the FAO 'Code of Conduct for responsible fisheries'.

The EU presence in distant fishing grounds is a legitimate objective and the Union's fisheries interests should be protected, whilst at the same time focusing on the development of the nations with which agreements are signed.

The partnership agreement identifies the current priorities for fisheries policy in Morocco: modernisation and upgrading of the coastal fleet, abolition of driftnets, scientific research, restructuring of small-scale fishing, updating of marketing channels, mechanisation of methods of landing and handling fish, and training and support for professional organisations in the Moroccan fisheries sector.

It can be imagined that some of these priorities may have an impact on the development of coastal populations living on fishing or on marketing fish. However, it would have been preferable to have measures targeted at this objective.

It might be recalled that the Union's development cooperation policy and the common fisheries policy (CFP) must be consistent, complementary and coordinated, contributing together to poverty reduction in the countries concerned and to sustainable development.

The protocol accompanying the agreement lays down the financial contribution, the categories of fishing activities for Community vessels in Moroccan fishing zones and the conditions governing them.

The financial contribution is fixed at EUR 36 100 000 per year. Slightly more than one third of this sum is to be put towards defining and implementing a sectoral fisheries policy in Morocco.

The fishing opportunities provided for in the agreement have been laid down: (1) for the small-scale fishing category: 20 seiners for fishing pelagic species in the north, 20 vessels for small-scale fishing in the south, 30 bottom longliners for small-scale fishing in the north, and 27 pole-and-line vessels; (2) 22 trawlers and bottom longliners for demersal fishing; (3) an annual quota of 60 000 tonnes for industrial pelagic fishing.

Ten European countries are authorised to fish in Moroccan waters, including for the first time vessels from the new Member States.

Shipowners' fees have been fixed for each category, and could contribute an additional annual income of around EUR 3 million for Morocco.

There is however one fundamental question which needs to be considered before the Committee on Development delivers its opinion on the Commission proposal.

Article 2(a) of the text initialled by the Commission reads as follows:

"Moroccan fishing zone" means the waters falling within the sovereignty or jurisdiction of the Kingdom of Morocco'.

The Committee on Development has asked Parliament's Legal Service for its opinion on whether the Community could agree to sign an agreement that authorises European vessels to fish in the waters of the former Spanish Sahara.

The reply from the Legal Service was in the affirmative.

According to the Legal Service, the important thing is that a share of the Community financial contribution should be set aside for the development of local populations in Western Sahara.

The Legal Service suggests that Parliament might receive an assurance from the Commission and Council that they will call on Morocco to provide the necessary guarantees in this regard, and that the Community would envisage suspending the agreement if the populations in Western Sahara do not receive part of the financial contribution.

## AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Development calls 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  
Recital 2 a (new)

***(2a) The Community financial contribution should also be used for the development of coastal populations living on fisheries in Morocco and Western Sahara and the creation of small and medium-sized local firms in the fisheries sector.***

---

<sup>1</sup> Not yet published in OJ.

## PROCEDURE

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Title</b>  | Proposal for a Council regulation on the conclusion of the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Community and the Kingdom of Morocco  |
| <b>References</b>   | COM(2005)0692 – C6-0040/2006 – 2005/0280(CNS)   |
| <b>Committee responsible</b>                                      | PECH  |
| <b>Opinion by</b><br>Date announced in plenary                    | DEVE<br>14.2.2006   |
| <b>Enhanced cooperation – date announced in plenary</b>           |   |
| <b>Drafts(wo)man</b><br>Date appointed                            | Thierry Cornillet<br>25.1.2006  |
| <b>Previous drafts(wo)man</b>                                     |   |
| <b>Discussed in committee</b>                                     | 13.3.2006      21.3.2006  |
| <b>Date adopted</b>   | 21.3.2006   |
| <b>Result of final vote</b>                                       | +:                      14<br>-:                      12<br>0:                      0   |
| <b>Members present for the final vote</b>                         | Margrietus van den Berg, Danutė Budreikaitė, Marie-Arlette Carlotti, Thierry Cornillet, Nirj Deva, Fernando Fernández Martín, Michael Gahler, Hélène Goudin, Filip Andrzej Kaczmarek, Glenys Kinnock, Ģirts Valdis Kristovskis, Maria Martens, Miguel Angel Martínez Martínez, Gay Mitchell, Luisa Morgantini, José Javier Pomés Ruiz, Horst Posdorf, Toomas Savi, Pierre Schapira, Frithjof Schmidt, Jürgen Schröder, Mauro Zani |
| <b>Substitute(s) present for the final vote</b>                   | Manolis Mavrommatis, Anne Van Lancker, Gabriele Zimmer  |
| <b>Substitute(s) under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote</b> | Carlos Carnero González   |
| <b>Comments (available in one language only)</b>                  | ...   |

## PROCEDURE

|   |   |                   |          |
|---|---|-------------------|----------|
| <b>Title</b>  | Proposal for a Council regulation on the conclusion of the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Community and the Kingdom of Morocco  |                   |          |
| <b>References</b>   | COM(2005)0692 – C6-0040/2006 –2005/0280(CNS)  |                   |          |
| <b>Date of consulting Parliament</b>  | 6.2.2006  |                   |          |
| <b>Committee responsible</b><br>Date announced in plenary                                     | PECH<br>14.2.2006   |                   |          |
| <b>Committee(s) asked for opinion(s)</b><br>Date announced in plenary                         | DEVE<br>14.2.2006   | BUDG<br>14.2.2006 |          |
| <b>Not delivering opinion(s)</b><br>Date of decision  | BUDG<br>24.4.2006   |                   |          |
| <b>Enhanced cooperation</b><br>Date announced in plenary                                      |   |                   |          |
| <b>Rapporteur(s)</b><br>Date appointed  | Daniel Varela Suanzes-Carpegna<br>15.2.2006   |                   |          |
| <b>Previous rapporteur(s)</b>   |   |                   |          |
| <b>Simplified procedure – date of decision</b>  |   |                   |          |
| <b>Legal basis disputed</b><br>Date of JURI opinion   |   |                   |          |
| <b>Financial endowment amended</b><br>Date of BUDG opinion                                    |   |                   |          |
| <b>Parliament to consult European Economic and Social Committee - date decided in plenary</b> |   |                   |          |
| <b>Parliament to consult Committee of the Regions - date decided in plenary</b>               |   |                   |          |
| <b>Discussed in committee</b>   | 22.2.2006   | 21.3.2006         | 3.4.2006 |
| <b>Date adopted</b>   | 3.5.2006  |                   |          |
| <b>Result of final vote</b>   | +:<br>-:<br>0:  | 21<br>4<br>6      |          |
| <b>Members present for the final vote</b>   | James Hugh Allister, Stavros Arnaoutakis, Elspeth Attwooll, Iles Braghetto, Niels Busk, Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos, Paulo Casaca, Zdzisław Kazimierz Chmielewski, Carmen Fraga Estévez, Ioannis Gklavakis, Alfred Gomolka, Pedro Guerreiro, Ian Hudghton, Heinz Kindermann, Henrik Dam Kristensen, Albert Jan Maat, Willy Meyer Pleite, Rosa Miguélez Ramos, Philippe Morillon, Willi Piecyk, Dirk Sterckx, Struan Stevenson, Margie Sudre, Daniel Varela Suanzes-Carpegna |                   |          |
| <b>Substitutes present for the final vote</b>   | Duarte Freitas, Ana Maria Gomes, Luis de Grandes Pascual, Manuel Medina Ortega, Francisco José Millán Mon, José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra, María Isabel Salinas García, Carl Schlyter  |                   |          |
| <b>Substitutes under Rule178(2) present for the final vote</b>                                |   |                   |          |
| <b>Date tabled</b>  | 4.5.2006  |                   |          |
| <b>Comments (available in one language)</b>   | ...   |                   |          |

|       |  |
|-------|--|
| only) |  |
|-------|--|